REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on January 29, 2004 (Paper No. 12) by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17. Applicants have amended claims 1,2, 7, 8, 12, and 14-17. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed January 29, 2004 and also render all currently pending claims at issue patentably distinct over the references of record.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Hartel. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended and now recites a method of window management on a display, at least including the step of opening and displaying a window containing a graphical overview of information related to a selected checklist, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist.

Independent Claim 12 is now directed to a program product comprising at least instructions executable by a computer to display a user-selectable list of a plurality of checklists, each checklist having at least one user-selectable task, wherein at least one task of the at least one user-selectable task is associated with a synoptic page containing a graphical overview of information relating to said task, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist, and wherein a determination whether the synoptic page should be displayed is made, and if said synoptic page should be displayed, said synoptic page is automatically displayed when the user selects said at least one task.

Independent Claim 14 has been amended and now recites a method of presenting a computerized checklist on a display comprising, *inter alia*, receiving an input indicating a selected task from the plurality of tasks to be selected; determining whether an associated graphical overview should be displayed, based on the selected task, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist; displaying the associated graphical overview, if the associated

graphical overview should be displayed; and displaying the selected task relating to said user-selected checklist, at least partially during displaying the associated graphical overview.

Hartel relates to an electronic checklist system to provide a checklist interface unit that allows the flight crew to access and execute both normal and non-normal checklists. However, Hartel does not remotely teach or suggest displaying a window containing a graphical overview of information related to a selected checklist, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist. Instead, Hartel only teaches a checklist system, wherein only checklists are displayed. See col. 2, ll. 7-10. Hence, Hartel does not disclose (or even remotely suggest) displaying a graphical overview, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist, as recited in independent Claims 1, 12 and 14.

Claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, claim 13 depends from claim 12, and claim 16 depends from claim 14. Therefore, Applicants rely on the above arguments for these claims as well.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable by Hartel in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,757 (Southgate).

Independent Claim 8 has been amended to now recite a method of window management on a display device for a checklist containing a plurality of tasks, said display device having a first display presented thereon, said first display having a frame layout having a first window therein, said method comprising, *inter alia*, determining whether a synoptic window containing a graphical overview of information that is associated with said task should be displayed, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist.

As noted above, Hartel relates to an electronic checklist system to provide a checklist interface unit that allows the flight crew to access and execute both normal and non-normal checklists. Hartel discloses displaying checklists that include checklist line items, various command buttons and page control buttons that may be activated by the user. Southgate relates to a method and apparatus for managing the display of multiple windows in a computer user interface and discloses using overlapping and/or tiled windows.

However, neither Southgate nor Hartel disclose or suggest determining whether a synoptic window containing a graphical overview of information that is associated with said task should be displayed, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist. Instead, Hartel discloses displaying checklists that include checklist line items that indicate the condition or status that must be achieved to complete the line item, not graphical overviews. Meanwhile Southgate only discusses windows and does not make up for the deficiencies of Hartel. Thus, neither Southgate nor Hartel even remotely teach or suggest displaying a graphical overview of information associated with a task, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist.

Claims 15 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hartel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,137 (Roe).

Claims 15 and 17 both depend on newly amended Claim 14 and thus, both include, *inter alia,* displaying a graphical overview of information associated with a task, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist. As previously noted, Hartel does not tach or suggest at least this feature. Roe relates to a method and apparatus for managing the display of multiple windows in a method and apparatus for displaying alarm information with four distinct windows: 1) alarm window, 2) alarm instruction window, 3) map display window and 4) alarm response window. However, Roe does not even remotely make up for the deficiencies of Hartel.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not use the teaching of Roe to come up with an aircraft checklist system that displays synoptic information, since Roe is non-analogous art.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, it is a basic tenet of patent law that a reference constitutes analogous art if it is either: (1) in the field of applicants' endeavor; or (2) is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Here, Roe is clearly not in the field of the inventor's endeavor. The invention disclosed in Roe is for use in the alarm system field, in particular, for providing an alarm system in a building. In contrast, the Applicant's field of endeavor relates to aviation and aerospace applications, including aircrafts.

Moreover, Roe is not pertinent to the problem with which the instant invention is concerned. The Examiner states that "Roe is used as a secondary reference to teach the

feature of displaying a diagram in synoptic information...since it would help a user to understand more about the synoptic information via the diagram". This is not the same problem that the Applicants are trying to solve. Instead, the instant invention was conceived to solve the problem of **limited display space** for pilot access to synoptic information. As such, it is submitted that Roe is not analogous art and therefore cannot be used as a basis for a rejection.

In view of the aforementioned arguments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the above, independent Claims 1-17 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Moreover, entry and consideration of this Amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 for at least the following reasons. The Amendment overcomes all of the rejections and objections set forth in the above-noted Office Action. The Amendment places the application in better form for appeal, which Applicants fully intend to pursue if necessary. The present Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. Therefore, entry and consideration of the present Amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and are hereby requested.

Hence, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated Feb. 24 2004

Cindy H. Kwacala
Registration No. 47,667
(480) 385-5060

Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, P.C.
Customer No. 29906